

REMARKS

Claims 10-23 are all the claims pending in the application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 10, 15, and 16 to further clarify the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Examiner's objections and rejections are adequately addressed in the Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 filed on August 25, 2008 and should be withdrawn for the reasons set forth therein.

Applicant, however, provides some additional remarks for the rejection of claims 10-12, 14-18, 20, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,055 to Bhargava et al. (hereinafter "Bhargava") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,373 to Guenther et al. (hereinafter "Guenther") and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0195642 to Ragnini (hereinafter "Ragnini"). Applicant respectfully traverses these grounds of rejection at least in view of the following additional exemplary comments.

In an exemplary, non-limiting embodiment, "shape sequence (machining shape information)" means shape information (expanded from the selected shape) that defines a shape to be machined (selected shape) by a machining unit that machines a work model to a product model, and a range to be machined (within which machining tools move) by the machining unit within the machining program. The method of describing the "shape sequence" differs in accordance with the type of machining (turning "end faces", milling "faces") conducted by the machining unit.

For example, in the face milling process, the machining area is defined by a closed shape made by a unicursal on a flat face or the like. When actually machining, a tool moving route is

generated in order that the tool can machine the area within the closed shape made by a unicursal, with the tool positioned at right angles to the defined flat surface, and then the tool is moved along the generated route. For example, in Fig. 53, the line of “1 LINE (SUPPORT)” defines a position of the surface, the starting position of the unicursal line and the state of the surface, while the lines from “2 LINE • •” to “5 LINE • •” defines the factors of the shape made by the unicursal line.

The above provided description of an exemplary embodiment is provided only to help the Examiner further understand the unique features of claim 10 quoted below and is not provided to limit the scope of the claims in any way.

Specifically, claim 10 *inter alia* recites: “wherein the inserted machining shape information indicates the machining shape of the machining unit that machines the work model into the product model and a machining area of the machining unit specified in the machining program.”

Applicant respectfully submits Bhargava does not disclose or suggest inserting machining shape information that indicates the machining shape of the machining unit that machines the work model into the product model and a machining area of the machining unit specified in the machining program. In Bhargava, only the name or radius of the unit can be modified (Figs. 10 and 12). In Bhargava, there is no disclosure or suggest that the machining shape information that indicates the machining shape of the machining unit that machines the work model into the product model and a machining area of the machining unit specified in the machining program,

as set forth in claim 10. Guenther and Ragnini do not cure the above-identified deficiencies of Bhargava.

For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claim 10 is patentable over the prior art of record. Claims 11, 12, 20, and 21 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 10.

Claims 15 and 16 recite features that are somewhat similar to, although not necessary coextensive with, the features set forth in claim 10 and argued above. For at least analogous additional exemplary reasons, therefore, claims 15 and 16 are patentable over Bhargava, Guenther, and Ragnini. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this rejection of claims 15 and 16. Claims 17 and 18 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 16 and claims 22 and 23 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on claim 15.

Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below to set up an Interview.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.114(c)
U.S. Application No.: 10/563,220

Attorney Docket No.: Q91974

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 36,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 23, 2008